

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated July 30, 2007. Accordingly, it is accompanied by a petition to extend the time for response by 1 month, together with the required fee.

Telephone Conference

The undersigned discussed the rejections of claim 34 with the Examiner in a telephone conference on October 31, 2007. No agreement as to the patentability of claim 34 was reached; however, the Examiner indicated that amendments to claim 34 such as those presented herein should be helpful toward, at least, eliminating Onofrio as the primary reference. It was tentatively agreed that, with amendments substantially as presented herein, Temple, U.S. Patent No. 3,332,118 would be the primary reference in any future rejections.

Similar amendments to method claims 58 and 59 have also been made.

Claim 34

Claim 34 is distinguished over Temple with respect to both the toggle bar and hole plug. Claim 34 has been further amended to clarify both of these distinctions.

First, claim 34 has been amended to clarify the nature of the toggle bar. In Temple, mere pivoting of the cross bar 3 is not sufficient to manipulate the structure so as to achieve the claimed functionality.

Second, claim 34 requires a hole plug. Temple lacks a hole plug; moreover, Temple seems to suggest in Figures 1, 2, and 3 that it is desired to allow the flexible cable to extend from the hole at an angle. **It would not make sense to fix this angle, so it follows that** Temple is suggesting that the cable should be allowed to change its angular orientation at the hole without bending, a goal which would be frustrated by constraining the passage of the cable through the hole by use of a hole plug as recited in claim 34 as amended.

Respectfully submitted,



Garth Fanke

Registration No. 40,662

03-228122-80